



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. V

NEW YORK, JANUARY 20, 1912

No. 12

In THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 457 reference was made to the projected publication of a volume to be edited by Professor Kelsey and to be entitled Latin and Greek in American Education. It was announced that the volume would gather together certain important papers which had been read at various times in the last six or seven years at the Classical Conferences at Ann Arbor. The volume appeared early in 1911. From the first I had planned to discuss it, at least in part, in these columns, particularly since I had been privileged to be present at two of the Classical Conferences covered by the book. Before I could carry out this purpose, an invitation came from the editor of the Educational Review to discuss the volume for that journal. What was said in that discussion (in the December number, 1911) is reprinted here by permission, with considerable modifications and additions. The book is of such importance that it cannot receive too much notice.

The first three chapters, entitled The Present Position of Latin and Greek (1-16), The Value of Latin and Greek as Educational Instruments (17-39), and Latin and Greek in our Courses of Study (40-58), are by Professor Kelsey. Chapter IV contains first an admirable article on The Nature of Culture Studies (59-81), by Dr. R. M. Wenley, Professor of Philosophy in the University of Michigan. Then comes a report of seven Symposia, held, all save the last, in 1905-1910 at the University of Michigan, as part of the Classical Conferences which for more than a dozen years have been held there annually in connection with the meetings of the Michigan Schoolmasters' Club. The seventh Symposium, consisting of three papers championing Formal Discipline (344-396), is not self-evidently a part of any Classical Conference, and has no direct connection with the Classics. From page 24, however, one may infer that it was included because in various places in this book emphasis is laid on the disciplinary value of classical study; since some important authorities on psychology have denied in toto the possibility of formal discipline, it seemed worth while, no doubt, to prove a possibility which, to the layman, is obvious and axiomatic¹.

¹ Since the above words were written Professor Kelsey has informed me that the papers on Formal Discipline were in fact called forth by requests of classical men and that they were really counted as part of the conference programme. "In the western institutions", he continues, "the attack on the Classics has been largely directed from the point of view controverted in this Symposium".

All parts of the book had been published within the past five years in The School Review or in the Educational Review; every paper, however, except one, whose author is dead, was revised for this book. It would have been easy and helpful to indicate at the beginning of each article exactly where it can be found in the original form¹. Again, a fuller account should have been given of the times at which and the circumstances under which the papers were written and the Symposia were held. The title of the book, manifestly won from that given by Professor Kelsey to his own articles when they appeared in the Educational Review, does not accurately fit the volume as a whole.

In Professor Kelsey's papers statistics of attendance on courses in Latin and Greek throughout our country have been brought up to date. Latin is more than holding its own, but Greek has lost ground. The discussion of the statistics is sane and suggestive. In his second paper Professor Kelsey urges in no uncertain terms the supreme value of the study of Latin and excellently discusses the various ways in which Latin and Greek become effective as educational instruments (21 ff., especially 21-25). He holds that Latin and Greek become effective as educational instruments in at least seven different ways:

- By training in the essentials of scientific method: observation, comparison, generalization;
- By making our own language intelligible and developing the power of expression;
- By bringing the mind into contact with literature in elemental forms;
- By giving insight into a basic civilization;
- By cultivating the constructive imagination;
- By clarifying moral ideals, and stimulating to right conduct;
- By furnishing means of recreation.

Particularly good is the exposition (36-38) of the ethical value of the study of the Classics. The forces of Nature, argues the author, are devoid of moral discrimination; in the wild state an animal rarely dies a natural death, and living creatures are arrayed in two classes, the hunting and the hunted.

The value of the study of literature, and particularly of the Greek and Roman Classics, in contributing to the upbuilding of character, lies in the clarifying of ethical distinctions through the analysis of concepts, characters and situations, and in inspira-

¹ For Professor Kelsey's papers see the Educational Review, December-February 1906-1907; for Professor Wenley's paper see The School Review 13; for the Symposia see The School Review 12-18, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 1.53; 2.58, 55, 62; 4.115-116.

tion to right conduct through contact with the highest ideals. A knowledge of the words by which the Greeks and Romans designated "right" and "wrong", the virtues and the vices, gives the student a new point of view for the judgment of actions and stimulates reflections on standards of conduct in larger relations. In ancient literature, free from the obfuscation of modern theories, we see the cardinal virtues limned in clear outline: love of country, loyalty to kin, devotion to duty, justice, reverence; and over against these, great vices—in laying the foundations of correct moral judgment, a knowledge of sin and its consequences is only less important than a knowledge of virtues. With what eagerness does a well-taught class follow the deeds and analyze the actions of Aeneas! They may now and then err in interpreting his conduct, because of an incomplete understanding of the Roman point of view; yet the process of submitting to critical examination the motives of a character of heroic stature on a plane of action remote from modern conditions and prejudices is an ethical discipline of no mean value. The study of the masterpieces of the modern foreign literatures is ordinarily less intensive than that of the ancient, and even when it is intensive, the character types leave a less powerful impress upon the youthful mind; they are too much like the men and women that one sees every day.

In his third paper Professor Kelsey argues that the time devoted to Latin and Greek in American schools is insufficient; the German student, even in the Realgymnasium, and the French student in the Lycée give much more time to them, in many cases twice as much. It is absurd, therefore, to indict American education because the American student of the Classics does not, by the time he is 18 years old, make as much progress in them as is made by the student in France or Germany <or England>. It is here that Professor Kelsey finds the chief explanation of the shortcomings in the teaching of Latin and Greek, though he does indeed speak his mind freely on the unpreparedness of many teachers of the Classics (54-56). C. K.

(To be continued.)

TRUE PRINCIPLES OF HOMERIC CRITICISM¹

The story of Phidias and his pupil, Alcamenes, has often been told. They competed for a prize in sculpture. The statue of Alcamenes was about to be chosen because of its exquisite finish, when Phidias objected to any decision until the statues should be put in the high position they were designed to occupy. At once, the opinions of the judges were reversed, for the apparently rough lines of Phidias's creation stood out in sublime majesty, while the polish of Alcamenes's was lost when both statues were raised aloft. The story illustrates a splendid rule of art which has often been forgotten in the study of Homer. The epics of Homer were not

made for the test-tube and the microscope. They were not made even for readers; they were composed for listeners. Put them on their proper pedestals and the minutiae revealed by the grammarians' microscope will be lost in the grand sweep of the story. You would as soon halt Shakespeare's Macbeth because of the anachronisms, or condemn Leonardo da Vinci's Last Supper because of modern masonry in the walls or carpentry in the table, as apply the philological and archaeological tests of the higher critics to Homer.

Apply the tests of art to Homer and judge him by those. Take the matter of the contradictions which critics have talked so much about. In many cases, especially where mythology was concerned, the material the poet had to handle bristled with inconsistencies and contradictions. Long ago Aristotle laid down the sensible rule for drama, and it is equally true for epic poetry, that the poet is not responsible for the improbabilities in his materials. The sculptor may have flaws in his block of marble; the painter may have defects in his lead or oil, or pigments; and the epic poet found contradictions in the fairy stories of mankind which he wove into the story he sang. That one consideration will sweep away instantly heaps of higher criticism.

Again, the artist is more taken up with the end than he is with the means. In the fervor of his composition he wreaks himself upon expression, he burns to embody his ideal and, engrossed in that, he is likely to be less observant of the material of his art. The achieving of the effect is more to him than mathematical accuracy in the use of the instruments by which he achieves the effect. He makes his hero win his battle; he may unhappily forget some of the tactics or even the geography of the battle-field. His object is not to teach the art of warfare or furnish the topography of the country, but to tell an interesting story in an interesting way. The Iliad has a wall that vexes many critics. It was built in the tenth year of the war, which was no time to build a wall, and was put up simply because Achilles left the field. Besides, according to these critics the wall appears and disappears strangely. So the conclusion is: Homer did not build the wall, but some other poet came along and projected his masonry into the epic. In answer it has been shown that the wall behaves very well, but, whether it does or not, it matters little. The poet is not a surveyor or a street commissioner. He wished to make his story interesting, to make the character of Achilles prominent, to bring some agreeable variety into what might prove a monotonous catalogue of similar battles. Those are reasons enough for a poet to build a Chinese wall or reduce it to dust when he does not want it, or conveniently overlook it in the heat of an imaginary charge.

¹ Reprinted from a journal called America, for September 23, 1911 (Volume 5, Number 24). Compare the author's paper in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 4.220-221. C. K.